


File Arrcom  
100961  
4.29.83  
49  
Environmental Health  
Vital Statistics  
Home Health  
Health Education  
Family Planning  
Well Child Conference  
WIC Clinics  
Immunizations



# PANHANDLE HEALTH DISTRICT I

P. O. Box 734  
1020 Michigan  
(Ella Street at Michigan Street)  
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864  
(208) 263-5159

April 29, 1983

John Meyer  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 6th  
M/S 524  
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear John:

At EPA's request an inspection of the Arrcom site was made on April 29, 1983 to determine the current condition of the tanks located at this site. Following is the results of that inspection. Please refer to the attached site plan for tank location and discriptions.

Tanks 2,3,4, and 5: These tanks appeared to be empty and in sound physical condition.

Tank 7: This tank had a small oil stained and oil built up area (approx. 4" x 10") at the bottom of one side of the tank. This could represent a small leak in the bottom of this tank. There was also some seepage from piping entering tank 7. This tank was about 3/4 full.

Tanks 8 and 9: These tanks appeared to be sound but did have some seepage from piping between these tanks.

Tank 10: There was a small amount of seepage around the outlet valve of Tank 10.

Tank 14: This tank is buried and the condition is not known.

Tank 16: This tank appeared to be sound and had no signs of leakage.

Tank 17: Tank 17 appeared to be sound and had no signs of leakage from the tank. There was a small drip from a coupling leading to tank 17.

Tank 11: This tank appeared to be sound and not leaking. However, there was a small drip from a pump located in building 13.



Tank 23: Ground around this tank is oil stained. However, the tank itself appears to be sound with no signs of leakage.

Tanks 21 and 22: These tanks are not connected and appeared to be empty. The area between building 15 and tank 19 and around tanks 21 and 22 is heavily oil stained.

Tank 19: This is a bolted seamed tank and many of the seams in the lower 2 feet of the tank were wet (not dripping) indicating some incomplete gasket sealing. The tank itself appears sound.

Tank 20: This tank appears to be sound and showed no signs of leakage.

In general, the condition of the site appears to be about the same as the last inspection. The tanks seem to be structurally sound with most of the seepage being from valves or pipe couplings. This inspection was an external visual inspection of the tanks, so the volumes and internal condition of the tanks is not known.

If you have any questions concerning this, or if we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,




Kenneth L. Babin  
Environmental Health Specialist

KLB/vg

Enclosure

cc: Steve Provant, EPA  
Daryl Koch, HAW-DOE

1. Water well
2. T-48 2,000 Gal. Re-refined oil
3. T-23 1,000 Gal. Re-refined oil
4. T-24 1,000 Gal. Re-refined oil
5. T-11 550 Gal. Re-refined oil
6. Electrical storage
7. T-47 2,000 Gal. Water separator
8. T-145 6,000 Gal. Finished oil storage
9. T-120 5,000 Gal. Finished oil storage
10. T-119 5,000 Gal. Finished oil storage
11. T-28 1,200 Gal. Electric heater tank
12. 48" shaker
13. Shaker building
14. T-144 6,000 Gal. Underground finished oil
15. Boiler room with work shop
16. T-142 6,000 Gal. Heater tank with coils
17. T-143 6,000 Gal. Heater tank with coils
18. Truck loading rack
19. T-1071 45,000 Gal. Waste oil storage
20. T-238 10,000 Gal. Waste oil storage
21. U-1 1,200 Gal. Treatment tanks
22. U-2 1,200 Gal. Treatment tanks
23. T-71 3,000 Gal. Fuel storage



WASTE OIL PROCESSING PLANT  
 DREXLER ENTERPRISES INC.  
 RATHDRUM, IDAHO  
 SCALE: 1"=25'

~~J. FEY~~  
~~C. RICE~~  
~~M. Brown~~

RCRA VIOLATION ASSESSMENT

Michael I. Bram Env. Eng.  
Name & Title of Evaluator

~~G. HOFER~~  
~~J. FEY~~  
FILE

Arrcom / Drexler

Rathdrum

Establishment Name and Address

IDD 000800961

Facility ID Number

Kenneth L. Babin / IDHW

Inspector/Lead Agency

4-29-83

Date of Inspection

"1"  
Status (See other side)

TSD  
Facility Type

Comments:

6-17-83

Same violations as last inspection 7-20-82

Class I violations

| ACTION TAKEN                        |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | No Action Indicated               |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Letter of Warning                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Referral For Admin. Civil Penalty |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Referral For Criminal Action      |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Refer to State                    |
| HWDMS DATA CODING                   |                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Initial 5/17/83 jef               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | After Compliance Review 8/9/83    |

MA

Concur

8/4/83

Date

Do Not Concur

Date

- 0 = IN COMPLIANCE
- 1 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASS 1 (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT)
- 2 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASS 2 (STATUTORY)
- 3 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASS 3 (ADMINISTRATIVE)
- 4 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASSES 1 AND 2
- 5 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASSES 1 AND 3
- 6 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASSES 2 AND 3
- 7 = NON-COMPLIANCE, CLASSES 1, 2, AND 3
- 8 = ENTRY INACTIVE, -RETAINED FOR REFERENCE
- 9 = NON-COMPLIANCE (STATE USE ONLY)

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DATE: May 11, 1983

SUBJECT: RCRA Inspections: ESI, Omark, Arrcom

FROM: Steve Provant, Air & Hazardous Waste Team Leader

TO: Chuck Rice, Air & Waste Management Branch, M/S 531

RECEIVED

MAY 16 1983

TECHNICAL OPERATIONS SECTION

Attached are RCRA inspection reports for ESI, Omark and Arrcom.

1. Omark - The only comment I have is on Item 14, Page 5 on the contingency plan. The response to the question on how it is known that the contingency plan has been submitted to local authorities has been updated via a telecom with Dale Geaudreau confirming that the new contingency plan has been distributed to local authorities.
2. Arrcom - This was not a typical inspection since Arrcom is not operating and EPA has issued a compliance order for cleanup of the site. The inspection was actually made in response to Section 7003 of RCRA and should count as a valid RCRA inspection in meeting Idaho's commitments. The standard RCRA inspection form does not apply in this case and therefore it was not filled out.
3. ESI - In my review of the DOE inspection, I did not identify any new discrepancies that should result in EPA taking enforcement actions.

I understand from Daryl Koch that there were some differences between he and Bob Stamnes on the interpretation of some of the inspection items. Since I was not present during the inspection and have not seen Bob Stamnes' report, my comments are on the basis of Daryl Koch's report.

Attachments:

RCRA inspection reports for: Omark, Arrcom, ESI

cc: Paul Boys, M/S329  
Bob Stamnes, M/S 533  
Daryl Koch, IDHW-DOE, Boise